

REMARKS

1. The Office action rejects Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) over Lapohn (U.S. Patent No. 5,770,797, hereinafter "Lapohn") in view of Patti (U.S. Patent No. 5,922,152, hereinafter "Patti"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 specify, *inter alia*, an air pressure measuring system comprising a bracket structure mounted entirely to an inside surface of a wheel assembly.

Lapohn discloses a tire pressure indication system in which the valve assemblies 18 are fastened to the rear side of a hub cap 20. *See Figs. 1, 1A, 6 and 7; col. 3, lines 45-50.* Applicant agrees with the Office action that there is no mention in Lapohn of a bracket structure that is mounted to the inside surface of the wheel rim. *See Paragraph 2 of the Office action.*

Patti discloses a wheel bracket 30 attached to a vehicle wheel rim. A first end 36 of the wheel bracket 30 is attached to an outer edge or lip 32 of a wheel 14. Teeth or barbs 38 and 40 are provided on the first end 36 for engaging the wheel rim and providing friction to prevent the wheel bracket 30 from accidentally disengaging the wheel rim. *See Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 26-29 and lines 41-46.*

It is respectfully submitted that there is no mention in Patti of at least the feature of a bracket structure mounted entirely to an inside surface of a wheel assembly, as recited in Claims 1, 8 and 15. By contrast, Patti teaches that the bracket 30 is mounted to an outer edge or lip 32 of the wheel 14, not entirely to the inside surface of the wheel assembly, as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the specification. In addition, it would not have been obvious to modify the bracket 30 of Patti because the first end 36 of the bracket 30 is required to be attached to the outer edge or lip 32 of the wheel 14 so that the bracket 30 does not become dislodged from the wheel 14.

On the other hand, mounting the air pressure indication system of the invention entirely to the inside surface of the wheel assembly, as recited in the claimed invention, provides advantages over the Patti arrangement. For example, in Patti, the bracket 30 protrudes from the wheel assembly, as shown in Figure 2. As a result, the component attached to the bracket 30 in Patti can become dislocated from the wheel assembly in the event the outer rim of the wheel assembly scrapes against a rigid structure, such as a curb, or

the like. By contrast, one of the advantages of the air pressure indication system of the invention being mounted entirely to the inside of the wheel assembly is to prevent the dislocation of the indication system in the event the wheel rim scrapes against a curb, or the like.

Because the combination of Lapohn and Patti does not disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as recited in Claims 1, 8 and 15, the Office action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *See MPEP §2143.*

For at least this reason, Claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Claims 3-7, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 9-14, which depend from Claim 8, are likewise allowable over the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

2. The Office action also rejects Claims 2 and 9 under 35 USC §103(a) over Lapohn and Patti, and further in view of Connell (U.S. Patent No. 3,915,502, hereinafter "Connell"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Connell discloses a double-coated adhesive tape 40 for mounting a wheel cover 10 to a wheel 24. The tape 40 preferably includes a resilient body with adhesive applied to opposite sides thereof. As shown in the drawing, the tape 40 is of circular shape, having a diameter equal to approximately half the overall diameter of the wheel cover assembly and being located radially approximately midway between the center and the perimeter of the wheel cover assembly.

Claims 2 and 9 depend from independent Claims 1 and 8, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Lapohn, Patti and Connell does not disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations, namely as least the feature of an air pressure measuring system comprising a bracket structure mounted entirely to an inside surface of a wheel assembly, as recited in Claims 1 and 8. Thus, the Office action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least this reason, Claims 2 and 9 are allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Attorney Docket: 65816-0004
S.N.: 09/978,377

Should Examiner Ferguson believe anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that any additional fees due with respect to this paper have already been identified. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper, permission is given to charge account number 18-0013 in the name of Rader, Fishman and Grauer PLLC.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter J. Rashid", is written over a horizontal line.

Peter J. Rashid, Reg. No. 39,464
Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC
39533 Woodward Ave., Suite 140
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
Attorney for Applicant

Telephone No. (248) 594-0624

Customer No. 010291